UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,220	09/29/2003	Jessy Rouyer	139165USNP	2505

24587 7590 09/26/2007
ALCATEL LUCENT
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
3400 W. PLANO PARKWAY, MS LEGL2
PLANO, TX 75075

EXAMINER	
CHRISS, ANDREW W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/674,220	ROUYER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Andrew Chriss	2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 August 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's Amendments and Accompanying Remarks, filed August 21, 2007, have been entered and have been carefully considered. Claim 2 is amended, as Claims 1-21 are pending.

2. Applicant's amendment of Claim 2 is accepted. Objection to Claim 2 is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. **Claims 1 and 8-11** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambe (United States Patent 7,061,876) in view of Doverspike et al (United States Patent 6,970,417), hereinafter Doverspike.

Regarding Claim 1, Ambe teaches a bridged network system, as shown in Figure 1A. The bridged network comprises a plurality of nodes (switches B1-B5), wherein each node is coupled to communicate with at least one other node in the plurality of nodes, and wherein the plurality of nodes comprise a bridge network between external nodes (terminals A11 through A53) located externally from the plurality of nodes. Further, each node is operable to receive a frame (packet) as shown in Figure 11, wherein the packet comprises a route indicator field (MAC address list), as shown in Figure 9B. Further, Ambe teaches that responsive to a packet being received prior to a time of failure between two of the plurality of nodes, the node transmits the packet along a first route in the system, as shown in step S14 in Figure 11. Examiner asserts

that a packet being received prior to a time of failure is equivalent to the normal operating conditions of a network. However, Ambe does not teach transmitting the packet along a second route in the system after a time of failure. In the same field of endeavor, Doverspike teaches a method responsive to a failure in a first path, rerouting traffic to a second communication path that had been identified prior to said failure (column 15, lines 18-27). Further, Doverspike discloses that the new communication path is node and span disjoint from the original data path (column 7, lines 52-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the path restoration taught in Doverspike with Ambe in order to only have error detection circuitry at edge nodes in the network and free resources within the network.

Regarding Claim 8, Ambe further teaches identifying a transmit port in the node that corresponds to a receipt port in the node, as shown in Figure 7. Further, Ambe teaches transmitting a frame (packet) via the ports (column 4, lines 41-45). However, Ambe does not teach transmitting the packet along a second route. In the same field of endeavor, Doverspike teaches transmitting a packet along a second route (column 15, lines 18-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the path restoration taught in Doverspike with Ambe in order to only have error detection circuitry at edge nodes in the network and free resources within the network.

Regarding Claim 9, Ambe further teaches an optimum spanning tree selection table, which does not contain a destination address (Figure 7). The optimum spanning tree is determined based on a hop count or by a path cost (column 2, lines 43-45). Therefore, the transmitting step is not responsive to a destination address in the packet.

Regarding Claim 10, Ambe teaches multiple nodes being operable to receive and transmit packets along any one of multiple routes, based on information contained in a spanning tree, until the packet reaches terminal A11 via switch B1, which serves as an egress node in the bridged network.

Regarding Claim 11, Ambe further teaches identifying a transmit port in the node that corresponds to a receipt port in the node, as shown in Figure 7. Further, Ambe teaches transmitting a frame (packet) via the ports (column 4, lines 41-45). However, Ambe does not teach transmitting the packet along a second route. In the same field of endeavor, Doverspike teaches transmitting a packet along a second route (column 15, lines 18-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the path restoration taught in Doverspike with Ambe in order to only have error detection circuitry at edge nodes in the network and free resources within the network.

5. **Claims 2-5 and 7** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambe in view of Doverspike, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Perlman et al (United States Patent 5,796,740), hereinafter Perlman.

Regarding Claim 2, Ambe and Doverspike teach all of the limitations of Claim 1, as discussed above. However, the references do not teach determining a third route in the system after the time of failure, receiving a second packet after the first packet, transmitting the second packet along the third route. In the same field of endeavor, Perlman teaches determining a third link and receiving a subsequent (second) packet. Further, Perlman teaches forwarding said subsequent packet along a third route (column 18, lines 61-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the packet forwarding

taught in Perlman with Ambe, as modified above, in order to reduce the time required to forward data packets.

Regarding Claim 3, Ambe-Doverspike-Perlman teach all of the limitations of Claim 2, as described above. However, Ambe and Doverspike do not teach changing the state of the route indicator field to cause transmission to the third route after receiving the second packet and prior to transmitting the second packet. In the same field of endeavor, Perlman teaches writing a data link address of a receiving end station into a data link destination address field of a first packet (column 2, lines 52-63) and forwarding said first packet onto said third link (column 18, lines 61-62). Further Perlman teaches writing a data link address into data link destination address field of subsequent packets (which would include a second packet) transmitted to said receiving end station. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the packet forwarding taught in Perlman with Ambe, as modified above, in order to reduce the time required to forward data packets.

Regarding Claim 4, Ambe-Doverspike-Perlman teach all of the limitations of Claim 3, as described above. Further, Ambe teaches the terminal A31 transmits an ARP response frame whose destination MAC address for terminal A11, which is external to the plurality of nodes. (Column 6, lines 21-27). The switch B3, in order to transmit the frame, consults an expanded learning table (Figure 6), which identifies a transmit port in the node that corresponds to a destination address (MAC address) in the packet. After consulting the expanded learning tree, the switch transmits the ARP response frame along a first route, using a default spanning tree, via a transmit port (column 6, lines 53-56).

Regarding Claim 5, Ambe-Doverspike-Perlman teach all of the limitations of Claim 4, as described above. Further, Ambe teaches identifying a transmit port in the node that corresponds to a destination address in the packet, as discussed with regards to Claim 4 above. However, Ambe does not teach transmitting the packet via the transmit port to the third route. In the same field of endeavor, Perlman teaches forwarding a packet along a third route, as discussed with regards to Claim 2 above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the packet forwarding taught in Perlman with Ambe, as modified above, in order to reduce the time required to forward data packets.

Regarding Claim 7, Ambe further teaches setting the route indicator field and transmitting it along the first route. However, the references do not teach performing these operations after receiving a second packet. In the same field of endeavor, Perlman teaches receiving a second packet, as discussed with regards to Claim 2 above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the packet forwarding taught in Perlman with Ambe, as modified above, in order to reduce the time required to forward data packets.

6. **Claim 6** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambe in view of Doverspike and Perlman as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Petersen et al (United States Patent 6,154,448), hereinafter Petersen. Ambe-Doverspike-Perlman teach all of the limitations of Claim 2, as described above. However, the references do not teach a node, adjacent to a failure in the first route, receiving the second packet. In the same field of endeavor, Petersen teaches a method for detecting a failure in a telecommunications network, wherein a second packet is received by a node adjacent to a failed link (column 11, lines 22-38). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the next hop loopback technique taught in Petersen with Ambe, as modified above, in order to implement the path restoration technique on an "as needed" basis rather than a periodic basis, thus conserving network resources.

7. **Claim 12-14, 16, and 17** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambe in view of Doverspike, as applied to Claims 1 above, and further in view of Navar et al (United States Patent 6,915,445), hereinafter Navar. Ambe and Doverspike teach all of the limitations of Claim 1, as described above. Further, Ambe teaches a first node (B3) in the plurality of nodes that receives a packet from a first external node (A31), thus comprising an ingress node. Ambe also teaches a second node (B1) in the plurality of nodes that is coupled to communicate the packet to a second external node (A11), thus comprising an egress node. However, the references do not teach, responsive to a node in the plurality of nodes receiving a packet as an ingress node, inserting an address of the ingress node and the egress node into the packet. In the same field of endeavor, Navar teaches a label switched router (LSR) 105 which acts as an ingress to a network. The LSR then switches the existing labels on the packets with new values representing ingress and egress addresses (column 6, lines 39-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Navar with Ambe, as modified above, in order to provide distributed processing, thus ensuring the routing will still be able to occur in spite of component failures.

Regarding Claim 13, Ambe further teaches transmitting the packet along either the first route or the second route by identifying a transmit port in the node (Figure 6) and transmitting

the packet via the transmit port to either the first or second route (Figure 8), as described with regards to Claim 5 above.

Regarding Claim 14, Ambe further teaches transmitting the packet along either the first or second route responsive to a value of an optimum spanning tree, equivalent to Applicant's route indicator field (Figure 8).

Regarding Claim 16, Ambe further teaches a first route and a second route comprising routes in a plurality of different routes, wherein each route is identified prior to a time of failure using an optimum spanning tree (Figure 7), equivalent to Applicant's route indicator field.

Regarding Claim 17, Ambe further teaches each route in the plurality of different routes being identified by a corresponding and different value in the optimum spanning tree (Figure 7), equivalent to Applicant's route indicator field.

8. **Claim 15** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambe in view of Doverspike and Navar, as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Habetha (United States Patent United States Patent 7,031,321). Ambe-Doverspike-Navar teach all of the limitations of Claim 14, as described above. However, the references do not teach the packet comprising a field indicating the allowability of an ingress node or a node adjacent a failure to change a state in the route indicator field. In the same field of endeavor, Habetha teaches an UPDATE TRIGGER message, which contains information on changes in the network topology (column 7, lines 41-51). This message would cause a node that receives it (e.g., an ingress node to a network, a node adjacent to a failure) to change its routing tables, and packets that come through. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the dynamic routing method taught in Habetha with Ambe, as modified

above, in order to reduce the quantity of data to be transmitted when updating local routing tables.

9. **Claims 18 and 19** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambe in view of Doverspike and Navar as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Nozaki et al (United States Patent 6,950,431), hereinafter Nozaki.

Regarding Claim 18, Ambe-Doverspike-Navar teach all of the limitations of Claim 16, as described above. However, the references do not teach the packet comprising a VLAN identifier field. In the same field of endeavor, Nozaki discloses a packet structure containing a VLAN-ID, as shown in Figure 3. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention the teachings of Nozaki with Ambe, as modified above, in order to provide an information relay technique capable of providing a multicast service without increasing the amount of control traffic in the network.

Regarding Claim 19, Ambe-Doverspike-Navar teach all of the limitations of Claim 18, as described above. However, the references do not teach the VLAN identifier field facilitating registration of selected different routes in the plurality of routes. In the same field of endeavor, Nozaki teaches a VLAN table in Figure 2 which uses the VLAN-ID to register multiple routes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention the teachings of Nozaki with Ambe, as modified above, in order to provide an information relay technique capable of providing a multicast service without increasing the amount of control traffic in the network.

10. **Claim 20** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambe in view of Doverspike and Navar as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Perlman. Ambe-

Doverspike-Navar teach all of the limitations of Claim 16, as discussed above. However, the references do not teach determining a third route in the system after the time of failure, receiving a second packet after the first packet, or transmitting the second packet along the third route. Perlman teaches determining a third route in the system, receiving a second packet, and transmitting the second packet along the third route, as discussed with regards to Claim 2 above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the packet forwarding taught in Perlman with Ambe, as modified above, in order to reduce the time required to forward data packets in order to reduce the time required to forward data packets.

11. **Claim 21** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ambe in view of Bentall et al (United States Patent 6,163,525), hereinafter Bentall. Ambe teaches a bridged network system, as shown in Figure 1A. The bridged network comprises a plurality of nodes (switches B1-B5), wherein each node is coupled to communicate with at least one other node in the plurality of nodes, and wherein the plurality of nodes comprise a bridge network between external nodes (terminals A11 through A53) located externally from the plurality of nodes. Further, each node is operable to receive a frame (packet) as shown in Figure 11, wherein the packet comprises a route indicator field (MAC address list), as shown in Figure 9B. Further, Ambe teaches that responsive to a packet being received prior to a time of failure between two of the plurality of nodes, the node transmits the packet along a first route in the system, as shown in step S14 in Figure 11. However, Ambe does not teach transmitting the packet along a second route in the system in response to an indication in a broadcast message. In the same field of endeavor, Bentall teaches a node that receives a flood (broadcast) message from a sender

indicating a failure (figure 9, column 9, lines 54-56). Further, Bentall teaches that the node continues communication (transmits a packet) using a selected alternative (second) route, shown in Figure 3. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the alternate path selection taught in Bentall with Ambe, as modified above, in order to reduce the number of search messages and response time.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed regarding rejection of Claims 1-21 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding rejection of Claims 1 and 8-11, Applicant argues that Claim 1 is patently distinguishable over the prior art because the Ambe and Doverspike references fail to teach the route indicator. Examiner maintains that the MAC address list taught in Figure 9B of Ambe is equivalent to Applicant's *claimed* route indicator field. Per the requirements set forth in MPEP 2106, the claims were treated with their broadest reasonable interpretation. Thusly, a field indicative of a destination route, address, path, etc. can be reasonably interpreted to read on the *claimed* route indicator field. Applicant further argues that Ambe and Doverspike fail to teach the link type field shown in Figure 2. However, as the claim cites the broad limitation of a route indicator field and does not cite the route indicator comprising a specific structure or specific fields, Examiner will not give weight to the link-type field.

Regarding rejection of Claims 2-5 and 7, Applicant argues that the Ambe and Doverspike references fail to teach the previously recited limitations. Examiner respectfully refers Applicant to response to arguments for Claims 1 and 8-11 above regarding the route

indicator field. Further, Applicant argues that Perlman does not teach " the step of receiving the second packet and prior to the step of transmitting the second packet, a step of changing a state of the route indicator field to cause transmission to the third route." Examiner maintains that Perlman teaches writing a data link address of a receiving end station into a data link destination address field of a first packet (column 2, lines 52-63) and forwarding said first packet onto said third link (column 18, lines 61-62). The relevant citation has been noted with regards to Claim 3 above.

Regarding rejection of Claim 6, Applicant argues that the Ambe and Doverspike references fail to teach the previously recited limitations. Examiner respectfully refers Applicant to response to arguments for Claim 2 above.

Regarding rejection of Claims 12-14, 16 and 17, Applicant argues that the Ambe and Doverspike references fail to teach the previously recited limitations. Examiner respectfully refers Applicant to response to arguments for Claim 1 above.

Regarding rejection of Claim 15, Applicant argues that the Ambe and Doverspike references fail to teach the previously recited limitations. Examiner respectfully refers Applicant to response to arguments for Claim 14 above. Applicant further argues that the UPDATE TRIGGER message taught in Habetha utilizes recognized prior art instead of a route indicator field. However, as the UPDATE TRIGGER message indicates that the routing tables shown in Figure 1 are to be updated, this performs a function equivalent to that cited in Claim 15, when applying the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim.

Regarding rejection of Claims 18-19, Applicant argues that the Ambe and Doverspike references fail to teach the previously recited limitations. Examiner respectfully refers Applicant to response to arguments for Claim 16 above.

Regarding rejection of Claim 20, Applicant argues that the Ambe and Doverspike references fail to teach the previously recited limitations. Examiner respectfully refers Applicant to response to arguments for Claim 16 above.

Regarding rejection of Claim 21, Applicant argues that the Ambe and Doverspike references fail to teach the previously recited limitations. Examiner respectfully refers Applicant to response to arguments for Claim 16 above.

Regarding Applicant's argument that a showing that the combinations made in rejections of Claims 1-21 would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art, Examiner respectfully refers Applicant to the motivation statements provided with rejection of each claim. Therefore, a prima facie case of obviousness has been established, per the requirements cited in MPEP 706.02(j).

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Saleh (United States Patent 7,002,917) is directed to a method for path selection in a network.

b. Di Benedetto (United States Patent 6,898,189) is directed to a restartable spanning tree for high availability network systems.

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Chriss whose telephone number is 571-272-1774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrew Chriss
Examiner
Art Unit 2616

AC

Chau T. Nguyen

CHAU NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600